



# THE AMERICAN

## A NATIONAL JOURNAL

VOL. XXVI—No. 669

PHILADELPHIA, SATURDAY, MAY 29, 1897

PRICE FIVE CENTS

### THE AMERICAN.

A NATIONAL JOURNAL.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY ON EACH SATURDAY.

[Entered at the Post Office at Philadelphia as matter of the second class.]

BARKER PUBLISHING COMPANY, PROPRIETORS.

WHARTON BARKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

BUSINESS AND EDITORIAL OFFICES,

ROOMS 24 and 26

Forrest Building, No. 119 South Fourth Street, Philadelphia.

#### SUBSCRIPTIONS AND ADVERTISING.

Subscription, \$2.00 per annum. Subscribers must notify us when they wish to discontinue.

Advertising rates for short or long time furnished on application.

Specimen copies sent on application.

A copy will be sent free to each advertiser during the continuance of his advertisement.

CHECKS, POSTAL ORDERS, ETC., should be drawn to order of BARKER PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\*Address through Post Office: THE AMERICAN, Box 1202, Philadelphia.

### CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE.

	PAGE
Notes of the Week . . . . .	345
EDITORIALS:	
The Defense and Defenders of Human Rights . . . . .	349
Railroad and Nation . . . . .	352
Wool Grower and Woolen Manufacturer . . . . .	353
Woman's Ways . . . . .	355
Words of Wisdom . . . . .	355
Book Reviews . . . . .	356
About Books and Writers . . . . .	358
Notes and Queries for Those Who Travel . . . . .	358
Nuggets and Nubbins . . . . .	359

### NOTES OF THE WEEK.

WHEN Senator Aldrich called up the tariff bill on Tuesday last, prefacing it with a statement of a most unexpected character, a statement from the ultra-protectionist standpoint reeking with heresy, he sowed seeds of discord in the Republican party, seeds that must rapidly germinate. He distinctly took issue with the Republican leaders in the House. He repudiated the principles of tariff and protective legislation set forth by Mr. Dingley and endorsed by the majority in the House as Republican doctrine. He put a radically different interpretation upon Republicanism than that placed upon it by Mr. Dingley. He read the mandate of the last election differently. So we find the Republican leaders of the Senate at loggerheads with the leaders of the House. Senator Aldrich has not only torn down Mr. Dingley's work, but taken occasion to repudiate the cardinal idea around which Mr. Dingley built his measure.

Mr. Dingley assumed that the election of Mr. McKinley was an expression of the demand for a return to the policy of high protection; Senator Aldrich denied that any such mandate could be drawn from the last election. Thus, taking departure from radically different grounds, they look upon tariff legislation dif-

ferently. Mr. Dingley went about building a tariff for revenue and protection. Senator Aldrich, while taking up the tariff passed by the House and remodelling it in accordance with his views, and though presenting such bill to the Senate and urging its passage, lets it be understood that in his opinion a general revision of our revenue laws is unnecessary, that the wise course would be to keep the present tariff as a basis, make such changes in revenue laws as would suffice to raise the additional revenue needed to cover our average deficits of the past few years, and there stop. Such a course, however, being out of the question, he tells us he has striven to carry out the tariff revision in a conservative spirit, and to frame such a moderate and reasonable measure, as, once adopted, would be likely to insure a greater degree of permanence to our tariff legislation. But, if this has been his aim, he has sadly failed to live up to it. Far from framing a tariff in a conservative spirit and building a moderate and reasonable measure, he has been guided by the spirit that looks after the interests of our industrial trusts and ignores the interests of our people, by the spirit that smiles upon centralized capital and the cliques and frowns upon independent enterprise, that fosters monopoly and tramples upon the interests of the general public, and accordingly he has built a most inequitable tariff, a tariff considerate of the interests of monopoly, not of our people, that cannot attract adhesion, that must invite attack, and that would, if enacted, have scant prospect of permanence.

BUT to let this pass, Senator Aldrich proclaims that his purpose has been to frame a moderate and reasonable tariff. He asserts that the Republican party has no warrant for the building of a high protective tariff. Whether it has a warrant to build a tariff highly protective of trusts he does not say. From his course we suppose it has. But a generally protective tariff, a tariff protective of all sections and classes, a tariff built primarily with a view to protection and not to the raising of revenue, Senator Aldrich declares the Republican party would not be warranted in imposing. This is what the Mugwump press has been asserting hysterically for months—what the Republican press has been as vehemently combatting. And now it appears Senator Aldrich's views are those of the gold Democrats, not of the Republicans, though his idea of the practical application of these views is very different from the idea taken by the Mugwump press, as evidenced by their violent attacks on the Senate Tariff bill, which Senator Aldrich now defends from the same ground that they attack it.

So we have Senator Aldrich's bill distasteful to gold Democrats and his views distasteful to Republicans at one and the same time. He does not ingratiate himself with Republicans when he boldly turns his back on the preachings of his party associates in the House and on the great part of his party press and asserts that it was "thoroughly understood throughout the country in the last political campaign that if the Republican party should be again entrusted with power, no extreme tariff legislation should follow. It was believed that in the changed conditions of the

country a return to the duties imposed by the act of 1890 would not be necessary, even from a protective standpoint."

Yet he is not crowned with laurels by the gold Democrats, who aided in the election of Mr. McKinley. Though gratified with such expression, they can scarce applaud the man, who, though expressing himself in accord with their views, does not live up to his preachings.

SENATOR ALDRICH'S statement of the scope of the tariff bill presented by him and his associates to the Senate is almost startling as evidencing the chaos of views held by Republicans and the widening gap between the leaders in the House and Senate. There is every prospect of a bitter struggle among Republicans over the bill. Mr. Dingley sees his bill mutilated past recognition by Mr. Aldrich, the very framework around which he built his measure ignored, and we are bound to have a pretty passage of arms over the bill, by Republicans especially, when it reaches the conference committee. Senator Aldrich's statements are loaded down with much sting and little balm for the supporters of the original Dingley tariff, and he is bitterly assailed by the Republican press, which has been rudely shocked by the attitude of antagonism to the measure framed by Mr. Dingley and advocacy of the bill pending before the Senate which he has taken. And what makes the sting more sharp and the shock ruder to bear is that Mr. Aldrich, in making the statement so vehemently assailed, spoke not for himself alone, but on behalf of the majority of the Senate Finance Committee. He voiced the sentiments of Senators Allison and Platt, who were present, and, we may assume, the sentiments of Senators Wolcott and Morrill, who were absent, the first in Europe looking up the prospects for international bimetalism, the second sick.

And now we are told that it is the consensus of opinion among these Republicans that industrial conditions having greatly changed, and prices having been greatly depressed, there is no demand or excuse for a return to the rates of the tariff of 1890. They tell us in effect that as we are suffering from hard times, we should build a hard-times tariff, that we should impose duties on a basis of the present low costs of production and the present low rates of wages. How such a tariff, built high enough to protect our people from foreign competition only so long as they work upon the present reduced social scale and make no effort to advance wages or ameliorate their condition, can possibly pave the way for better times, we are at a loss to see. Senator Aldrich does not tell us. He only tells us that the majority of the committee, without relinquishing one particle of their devotion to the cause of protection, feel that they have the right to ask that the cause shall not be burdened by the imposition of duties which are unnecessary or excessive. But when it is declared that a duty imposed on other basis than that of hard times and low wages is unnecessary and excessive, we feel that the committee relinquishes many particles of devotion to protection.

IN HIS estimates of the revenue yield of the tariff from customs, Senator Aldrich is most moderate. He has reason to be, for his aim is to show the need of looking to additional internal revenue taxes for a part of the revenue he aims to raise. Very properly he points out that but little revenue can be looked for from the wool and woollen schedules for a year or two to come, that, though it is proposed to transfer wool from the free to the dutiable list, and that such transfer would in time yield considerable revenue, no immediate accretion of revenue on this score can be counted upon, for the importations of wool, in anticipation of the re-imposition of a wool duty, have been large, our markets are stocked with a supply of foreign wool that together with our own clip will last us up to January 1, 1900, and prior to that time there is no reason to look for large importations of wool or any material increase of revenues from this source.

But the yield of revenue from some schedules Senator Aldrich seems to put too low. Thus he estimates the revenues from the sugar schedule at but \$38,000,000. We see no reason for putting the estimate of probable revenues from sugar so low. It is probable that the proposed duties on sugar would yield nearly double this sum, and Senator Aldrich inadvertently admits this in another connection when he says that we now consume, on a basis of foreign values, approximately \$90,000,000 worth of sugar a year, and that if the proposed rates should be adopted the national cost of sugar to our consumers would be more than \$160,000,000, which would indicate a revenue from sugar of \$70,000,000.

Now we have need of close to 4,000,000,000 pounds of foreign sugar annually. At some future time we may raise all the sugar we need, but we will not do so next year or the year after. At present we must import this sugar, and the tariff rates suggested by the Senate bill on sugars testing 96 parts pure, and such are the sugars we most largely import, are a specific duty of .95 of a cent per pound and 35 per cent. *ad valorem*, equivalent to .70 of a cent or more, the average value of this sugar being something over two cents a pound. The rate of duty on such sugar, provided for by the pending tariff, would therefore be not less than 1.65 cents a pound and this duty collected on 4,000,000,000 pounds of sugar would yield a revenue of \$66,000,000. But Senator Aldrich tells us that one-quarter of a year's supply of raw sugar will probably be imported in anticipation of the raising of rates. So we may have for the first year of the new tariff to import but 3,000,000,000 pounds of sugar and the duty on this would fall a little short of \$50,000,000. But this is considerably in excess of Mr. Aldrich's estimates.

BUT IT is Mr. Aldrich's purpose to figure out the minimum rather than the maximum yield from customs dues under the rates provided for by the pending bill. He figures out that the revenues derived from customs under the new rates of duty, together with the estimated internal revenue receipts, on a basis of present taxes, and the miscellaneous receipts of the Government, would fall short of meeting the expenditures by nearly \$22,000,000. Hence the excuse he puts forward for placing additional internal revenue taxes on beer and tobacco, and he sounds the alarm that an additional deficiency in the immediate future, which would require a further issue of bonds to meet current expenditures, would certainly be fatal to the hopes of future success for the Republican party. But his note of alarm is not well taken. There is not the slightest prospect of a further issue of bonds to meet current expenses. There is a balance in the Treasury of \$231,000,000, a free balance of \$131,000,000, and it would take some years for a deficit in revenues caused by failure to raise \$22,000,000 by extra taxes on beer and tobacco to eat up this sum so as to require an issue of bonds to meet current expenditures. There is indeed a prospect of a further issue of bonds, but it is not needed and there is no prospect that it will be needed to meet a deficit in revenues. But there is a prospect that an issue of bonds will be needed to replenish the gold reserve, and such issue will rest as a blot on the Republican horoscope.

ONE TRUTH Senator Aldrich makes clear, and that is that a protective tariff cannot be relied on for revenue. Resulting in a building up of domestic industries and the development of our own resources, a protective tariff must free us from dependence on foreign markets, lead to a repression of imports and hence of customs dues derived from such articles. So we must expect, in the years to come, a decrease rather than an increase in the customs revenues to be derived from the protective schedules of the tariff. Even sugar, which has ever been a reliable source of revenue, may cease to remain such, through



the development of beet sugar production and a resulting diminished use on our part of foreign cane sugars.

Senator Aldrich points to all this as indicating that we must look in the future, more and more, beyond protective tariff rates as the source of our revenues. We must, he concludes, place more reliance on internal revenue taxes. But internal revenue taxes such as are now imposed do not lead to an equitable distribution of the burden of taxation. They throw upon the poor much more than a fair share of taxation, in the same way as do import duties imposed for revenue. Thus in the new tariff bill we have an import duty of 10 cents a pound placed on tea, and the rich man using no more tea than the poor man, the millionaire will pay no more of this tax than the man earning a dollar a day. And the same is true with the internal revenue taxes on beer and whiskey.

A revenue raised in such way falls most burdensomely upon the poor, but most lightly upon the rich. Though the rich, in proportion to the amount of their property protected at public charge, get a greater advantage from government than the men without property, and should pay a share of the cost of the maintenance of government proportionate to the benefits conferred, such burden does not fall upon them, but is borne by the poor for them, when the revenue for the maintenance of government is gathered from revenue duties imposed upon articles of general use. When the revenues are thus raised, the rich man pays no more for the maintenance of government than the poor, though he receives greater advantages and is better able to bear the burden of taxation.

The tax of the future, which the Government must impose in order to distribute the burden of taxation equitably, is an income tax. It is on the income tax, not internal revenue taxes, that we must fall back upon when tariff duties imposed for protection have served their purpose, and cease to yield revenue. Under our present system of federal taxation the poor bear the cost of government, the rich, in large measure, escape. It is only in the maintenance of municipal government, where reliance is placed on the taxation of property, that the owners of property bear their just share of taxation.

SENATOR ALDRICH comes to the defense of the Sugar Trust very adroitly. He sets out by asserting that the Sugar Trust is entitled to fair treatment, which we are not disposed to question. We call the sugar schedule in question, merely because it extends to the Trust more than fair treatment, extends advantages which the Trust has been prone to abuse to the great injury of the consumers of sugar. Senator Aldrich goes on to say that it is important from every economic standpoint that we make it possible that the refining of sugar can be successfully carried on here, and that the fact that the Trust refines 90 per cent. of the sugar refined in the United States should not be allowed to furnish a pretext in the preparation of a tariff bill constructed upon protective lines, for the destruction of a great industry. But no one proposes to destroy a great industry; we merely propose that a great industry shall not, under the sheltering arm of government, be permitted to prey upon and destroy a great people. No trust aiming to lay a tribute on our people is entitled to aid from the Government in the shape of protective tariff duties, for it is not the part of government, at least of a Republican government, to despoil one man of his property for the benefit of another. On the contrary, it is the duty of government to protect the weak from despoilment, and, therefore, it is its duty to overthrow trusts, to take the part of our people against the trusts, not of the trusts against the people.

As to the assertion that the sugar industry would be destroyed by withholding from it the protection extended by discriminating duties, that is, the duty levied on refined sugar in excess of the duty collected on the raw sugar used in its production, it is folly. Mr. Havemeyer, grasping for a special privilege,

the privilege of refining sugar in bond, testified before the Ways and Means Committee of the House that if the Trust could refine sugar in bond, he did not see why "it could not supply a very large proportion of the world's consumption." It is evident from this that the Trust could, in Mr. Havemeyer's judgment, compete successfully in the world's markets, successfully meet all rivals without protection of any kind from the Government, and that to deprive the Trust of all protection would not destroy a great industry.

The placing of the Trust under the protection of tariff duties only serves to enable the Trust to raise the price of sugar to our consumers by the amount of the preferential duty, and thus swell its profits at the expense of our people.

It is further advanced in defense of the sugar schedule in the Senate bill that the preferential duty provided for is less than that provided for in the House bill, indeed less than one-tenth of a cent a pound. Senator Aldrich makes this statement, but we cannot but question his figures. The minimum differential rate favoring the Sugar Trust is at least three times this figure. The rate on refined sugar provided for is a specific duty of 1.16 cents a pound, and an *ad valorem* duty of 35 per cent., which, on a basis of last year's values, comes to the equivalent of .99 of a cent a pound, or a total duty on refined sugar of 2.15 cents. Now, two-thirds of refined sugar is made out of raw sugars testing 96 parts pure, a hundred pounds of this sugar making from 92 to 94 pounds of refined sugar. The specific duty on this quality of sugar would come to .95 of a cent, besides which there is an *ad valorem* duty of 35 per cent., equivalent, on a basis of present values, to a little over .70 of a cent. So the duty on a pound of this raw sugar would be 1.65 cents. But, as it would take about 1 1/2 pounds of this sugar to make a pound of refined, the total duty on the sugar used in making a pound of refined would be 1.79 cents, a differential in favor of the Trust of .36 of a cent a pound. And when lower grades of sugar were used, this differential would, as Senator Aldrich admits, be greater. On grades of sugar below 87 degrees, the rate of duty on which being entirely *ad valorem*, would fluctuate with the invoice value, the differential duty would be quite 3/4 of a cent a pound if the Trust could succeed in invoicing such sugars at 1 1/2 cents a pound, which would be quite possible when the Trust purchased the entire crop of an island, and there would be no means of discovering fraud in the invoiced value.

The impression made by Senator Aldrich's special plea in defence of the Sugar Trust schedule may be summed up in these words, credited to a Senator: "Senator Aldrich made a very clear and exhaustive explanation of the sugar schedule. I did not understand it, but it sounded all right." It will look all wrong when the glamor thrown upon it by Senator Aldrich wears away and the truth shines through.

A STRENUOUS effort is being made to harmonize the differences of Republican Senators in caucus, and keep the quarrels from breaking out in open Senate. Whether this plan will be crowned with success remains to be seen. We scarcely believe it will be, for it seems impossible that all the Republican Senators should bind themselves, in all things, to the mandate of the party caucus. There have already been some very lively times in caucus. In the very first tariff caucus Senator Lodge announced that he did not see how he could refuse to vote for an amendment to keep hides on the free list. The protest from Western Senators was at once vehement and incisive. They came back with the threat that if the Senator from Massachusetts saw fit to break the party caucus and vote against their interests, they too would refuse to be bound by the mandate of the caucus, and retaliate by voting to reduce, if not put on the free list, some products coming into competition with the industries of the Bay State.

But whether the Republicans of the Senate will be measurably successful or not in keeping their quarrels within themselves, such quarrels are sure to break out, and with much bitterness, in the Conference Committee between the two Houses that will come later. The differences between the Republican leaders of House and Senate are extreme, the mutual jealousy great, and coals are being rapidly added to the fires of dissension. In short, the course of the tariff bill will be henceforth over rough waters, waters roughened by the turmoil of Republicans rather than by the blasts of Democrats.

THE impatience of the Republican press with the delay over the tariff bill is growing most marked, but they quite forget to put the responsibility for this delay where it belongs. Thus, we have the *Philadelphia Press* declaring that at last the Senate is ready to proceed with the consideration of the tariff bill. "The delay has been well-nigh insupportable. It is two months since the bill passed the House. It is nearly a month since it was reported to the Senate. Had the spirit of the House prevailed in the other chamber, the measure would now be almost ready for the statute book." But it is not the Senate, as a body, that is responsible for this delay. The responsibility for delay rests with the coterie of Republican Senators, who, undertook to revise the bill passed by the House, who found the time they took for revisal all too short, who framed withal such a crude, involved and contradictory bill, that they have as yet been unable to explain it to anyone's satisfaction.

And so, too, we have the *Inquirer* finding fault with the Senate for adjourning as a mark of respect to the late Senator Earle. But there was good reason for this adjournment other than the death of Senator Earle, and that reason was made by the Republicans. They put in a full afternoon's time in striving to unravel quarrels and smooth out differences in party caucus, so as to facilitate the path of the measure in the Senate. It is the discord and dissension among Republicans that is, and has been the occasion of the delay with the tariff bill.

THE gold contractionists have little confidence in the stability of the gold standard. They are in a panic of fear, lest war with Spain should come and be followed by suspension of gold payments. And, fearful of such a result, they attribute to the silver men in the Senate the desire to bring about war with Spain for this purpose. "There may easily be," says the *New York Herald*, "a connection between this jingoism and the desire to force the country to a silver basis." But the worshippers of Mammon make a great mistake in weighing the purposes of others by their own sordid motives. The men who supported the Morgan belligerency resolution did so because they were not bereft of human feelings. The men who feel only through their pockets and have no eye nor ear for the sufferings of others made the backbone of the opposition to this resolution, and it is hardly their place to attribute base motives to others.

And a handsome comment is this on our gold standard, that it cannot be trusted in an hour of trouble; that it does not make a broad enough basis upon which to fight a war with Spain. "Before a gun should be fired," says one of our gold idolaters, "our gold would be sucked up and the Government required to issue fresh loans for the maintenance of the Treasury reserve, or surrender without further resistance to the silver standard." Even Mr. Gage is reported to be so much under the spell of this fear as to oppose any intervention on our part in behalf of the Cubans. Truly, the love of gold binds the energies, narrows the powers, smothers the spirit and undermines the liberties of our people; holds us back as a nation from doing that which we ought and should.

AMONG the objections raised to granting the Cubans belli-

gerent rights those of Mammon take precedence. It is asserted that such action on our part would relieve Spain from all liability for damages done to the property of our citizens in Cuba, and thus do injury to our people. By acknowledging the Cubans as belligerents we would indeed lose all claim upon Spain for the destruction of property at the hands of the insurgents. We would, thereafter, have to look to the Cubans for redress for injuries done to our citizens or their property within the lines of the insurgents. The responsibility of Spain for the protection of our citizens and their property within the Spanish lines would remain as now, but as far as that responsibility goes in a money way it may be considered as nil. There are now claims of our citizens for hundreds of thousands of dollars filed against Spain. But such claims are as worthless as the paper they are written on, as are all claims upon a bankrupt. Our citizens would stand a much better chance for redress for injuries at the hands of Cuba, a rising republic, than at the hands of Spain, a decadent monarchy.

Further objection is raised to our interference in Cuba on the ground that such action would lead to the annexation of the island to the United States, which under present conditions would be a most undesirable outcome, for we do not want to incorporate a Latin people into our nation. Indeed our nation is only fitted to grow in the direction that it can as a common whole, for the nature of our institutions demands that our people have common interests, common aims, common habits of thought and action. To grow as a conglomerate of different peoples our nation is not fitted. We can safely welcome immigrants of various nations who come to our shores, for when they come to live among us we can assimilate them and make them parts of our own people. But a people localized, as the Cubans are, we cannot assimilate, and if we cannot assimilate them we cannot accept them as part of our nation. Therefore we do not want to annex Cuba. But our granting of belligerent rights to the Cubans, our interference to secure them their independence are not of necessity steps to annexation. They would only point that way at our direction.

It may be that, once free and independent, our people will emigrate to the welcoming soil of Cuba, that the people of Cuba, the Latin races, would be assimilated by the new emigrants, rather than the emigrants be assimilated as a Latin people, and thus, in time, Cuba may become an Anglo-Saxon, rather than a Latin island. In that event, Cuba will gravitate naturally, irresistibly towards annexation, and then we will gladly welcome her into our Union. We never will while she remains Latin. As a Latin island, she must remain independent or unite with some other Latin race.

MR. MCKINLEY seems to have no settled Cuban policy. He seems to be content to let things drift, to let the slaughter in Cuba continue and await the turn of events. And events are turning very rapidly, especially in Spain, where a personal insult by the Minister of Foreign Affairs to a Liberal Senator has brought on a Cabinet crisis. What will be the outcome time alone can tell. Spain seems to be exhausted by her colonial wars, and on the verge of revolution. Yet, in her extremity, the Canovas ministry, speaking for her, haughtily spurns all suggestions of mediation on our part. The Spanish, we are proudly told, would rather be driven out of Cuba than voluntarily surrender their sovereignty over Cuba, a sovereignty already doomed, in consideration of a money indemnity.

Mr. McKinley would be doing Spain and the Spanish people a favor if he firmly called upon them to recognize that which they have not the courage to recognize themselves, namely, that Cuba is lost to the Spanish crown. But pursuit of a policy of vacillation rather than firmness seems to be inseparable from Mr. McKinley's nature. When he should be deciding for Spain that which she cannot decide for herself, he acts as if it were possible



for Spain to retain her sovereignty over Cuba, seeking out a minister to send to Madrid, if we can credit rumor, who is most pro-Cuban in his sympathies, who would rather see the United States interfere in Cuba to crush the rebels, than to interfere to put the Spanish out of Cuba. This man is ex-Senator Edmunds of Vermont, and it is said only one thing, doubt as to his acceptance of the office, stands in the way of his appointment.

THE attention of the country is again attracted to several bank failures, the suspension of two New Hampshire savings funds, unfortunate investors in Western farm mortgages, being among the number. It is an instance where a policy that has led to the fall in prices to the loss of producers and great satisfaction of lenders, of those with fixed incomes, has run its inevitable course, bankrupted debtors and reacted to the loss of creditors. But creditors are losing from the gold standard in another way than this. They are losing through a fall in the interest rates at which they can invest their money with safety, as well as through loss of the principal of their investments consequent on industrial ruin and the bankruptcy of their debtors.

Nothing gives stronger evidence of industrial stagnation, of the fear men have to invest their money in productive enterprises and the difficulty they have in finding satisfactory opportunities for investment at good rates of interest, than the returns of our national banks, which show a steady piling up of unused funds in the banks. Thus the returns show an increase of deposits between October and March last of \$72,000,000. The cash holdings of the banks also increased by \$77,000,000, but their loans did not increase at all. Such figures make far from a satisfactory showing. They show that the industry of the country, instead of reviving, continues to stagnate.

#### THE DEFENCE AND DEFENDERS OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

ARE human rights, liberty, to be crushed to earth, that property rights, a moneyed oligarchy, may be enthroned? This is the all-important question before the American people, into which all others are resolved, a question often, too often, lost sight of in consideration of detail, but which, ever present, cannot safely be ignored. To do so is to open the way to the enslavement of our industrial classes, the undermining of the Republic and the building up of an oligarchy.

A generation ago, the nation, in bloody strife, overthrew one oligarchy, the slave-holding oligarchy of the South, an oligarchy as detrimental to master as to slave. At the same time the seeds of a new and more far-reaching oligarchy were sown. The war called into being a new class. It made the opportunity for a class caring less for country than for self, caring naught for the sufferings of humanity, weighing not injustice where their pockets were concerned, caring more for the dictates of Mammon than the teachings of the Saviour of man, to exalt themselves in riches, in power, in the eyes of man but not of God, upon the sacrifices of their fellow-men. The sacrifices cheerfully made by our people to overthrow the oligarchy of slavery, to free the black slave from bondage, the cheerful offering up of life and property on the altar of human rights, the un murmuring payment of burdensome taxes gave evidence of the highest of patriotism. But there were men in the North who saw in the war only a source of profit, men who made no voluntary sacrifice, who offered neither life nor property in defence of their country, who protested against bearing their share of taxation and schemed to throw the whole expense of the war, an expense that they schemed to double or treble, upon those least able to bear it, upon those fighting the nation's battles, filling the nation's purse. These men were the money-lenders, men without sympathy for

man or country. And as the sacrifices made by our people were worthy of the highest patriotism, the contemptible effort of these men to profit from such sacrifices, to take advantage of a people in the hour of their direst need, was the foulest of treason.

Yet patriots suffered while traitors prospered. The war made a demand for money. The money-lenders took advantage of it to exalt money above man, and so ultimately to enslave man for their enrichment. The Government, pressed for money, issued its promises to pay at some indefinite future. The first issues of these promises to pay, known as demand notes, were received by the Government in payment of all public dues. They never depreciated. First, \$50,000,000 were issued; then \$10,000,000 more. They were soon exhausted. The issue of more notes of identical kind was proposed, the Government was in dire need, such issue would have brought relief, but in its extremity the money-lenders stood in the way. They fought the issue, denied the Government this relief until tribute was paid them. Their representatives in the Halls of Congress refused to authorize an additional issue of notes until their demands were complied with. These demands were that the notes which were made exchangeable at their face value for Government bonds should be discredited, systematically depreciated by the Government. They demanded that all further issues of notes should be made with the explicit declaration that they were inferior to gold, that though good enough to pay the soldiers on the battle-field they were not good enough to pay the interest on the public debt and would not be received by the Government for customs dues. The defenders of human rights in Congress, confronted with the alternative of suffering the collapse of the finances of the Government and of the war, or yielding to the demands of the money-lenders, vehemently protested, but surrendered.

So the greenbacks were issued with the demanded exception clause; issued, discredited by the very stamp put upon them by the Government, made receivable for all dues, public and private, except for customs dues and interest on the public debt. They rapidly depreciated to sixty, fifty, forty cents on the dollar, and at such depreciation were exchanged, at their face value, for Government bonds. Thus for \$400, or \$500, or \$600 the money lenders secured bonds for \$1,000. In this way was the cost of the war doubled. In this way was the burden falling upon our wealth-producing classes, who were fighting the battles of the nation, and who bore the weight of taxation, increased.

But it was not alone in this way that the money-lenders profited out of the war, profited by adding to the sacrifices others were called upon to make. They did not stop with this depreciation of the greenbacks. They schemed to still further exalt money above man. The bonds that they paid for in greenbacks depreciated one-half or more, were made payable in coin, and this coin was, by discarding silver as a money metal, made to mean gold coin, and coin that was doubled in value by the doubling of the demand for it. Thus were debts contracted during the war quadrupled. First, they were doubled by depreciating by one-half the greenback in which they were contracted, then they were again doubled by enhancing the value of the coin in which they were made payable. This holds good, not only to Government debts, but to private debts as well, for all debts were contracted and paid upon the same inequitable terms. In this way was an oligarchy of money built up, an oligarchy of the North and East in place of an oligarchy of the South, and thus the seeds of a new sectionalism sown.

And to these ends has the Republican party lent itself. It has championed the dear dollar, done nothing to rectify the wrongs of a system that has made debts payable in dollars worth four times as much as the dollar borrowed, and thus lent itself to exalting an oligarchy even more dangerous to the future of our country than the oligarchy it overthrew. Having changed its principles, it has outlived its usefulness.

But the tale of the building up of the oligarchy of to-day is but half told. It is not alone through the enhancement of the value of our dollar that money has been exalted above man and an oligarchy of wealth built up. And here let us remark that we do not decry the accumulation of wealth. Indeed, the rapidity of the accumulation of wealth measures the rapidity of a nation's progress, measures its advancement, limits the degree of comfort, enjoyment and civilization a nation may attain. It is the accumulation of wealth, of capital, that makes progress possible, that makes possible that diversification of industries that makes labor most productive, brings to man the greatest command over the resources of nature, and should bring him greatest comfort and enjoyment. But the centralization of wealth in a few hands, through inequitable laws of man, does not tend to stimulate either the production or accumulation of wealth. It stifles both, stifles industry, checks progress. The oligarchy built on slavery enriched individuals, but impoverished the South; so the moneyed oligarchy of to-day enriches individuals, but impoverishes the nation, retards the production and accumulation of wealth.

Wealth accumulated by honest labor is of advantage to the nation no less than the individual. Wealth accumulated by robbing others of their labor, or fruits of their labor, may enrich the individual in worldly goods, though not in the enjoyment of life in the present or the hereafter, but it must grievously injure the nation. Wealth dishonestly accumulated is as undesirable as wealth honestly accumulated is desirable. The accumulation of wealth in the first way builds up an oligarchy; in the second, a free, enlightened and contented people. The effort of the man who strives to accumulate wealth honestly is as commendable as the accumulation of wealth by the robbery of others, whether under the cloak of legal form or no, is reprehensible.

To secure every man an equal chance in the accumulation of wealth and protect him in the enjoyment of the wealth he produces, so that he may derive from it the greatest possible enjoyment, should be the aim of every just government. Unfortunately, this has not been the guiding principle of our professedly free Government, builded on the great truth that all men are created equal, not indeed in attainments, not in energy, but with the right to exercise those attainments and that energy with which they have been gifted on a perfect equality with their fellows and with an equal right to the disposal of their labor and the enjoyment of the fruits of their toil.

We have seen how our producing classes have been deprived of the fruits of their toil and an oligarchy of money built up through a monetary system that has doubled, if not quadrupled, the burden of debts, requiring debtors to pay debts in dollars worth much more than the dollars borrowed. But, as we have said, it is not only through the enhancement of the dollar that our producing classes have been robbed of the fruits of their toil, wealth centralized and an oligarchy built up that exalts the rights of property above the rights of man. Our transportation systems have been turned into engines of speculation and used most effectively in the building up of the wealth of the speculative cliques, of the great fortunes of to-day, upon the impoverishment of the productive classes, deprived of the fruits of their toil. By a system of over-capitalization and discrimination in charges, the railroads, creatures of the State, enjoying valuable public franchises, have become a curse to those whom they were created to serve. They have built up the country, unquestionably, but that while building up some centres and some industries, they have pulled down others, retarding growth in some directions while facilitating it in others, is equally undeniable.

Capitalized at much more than cost, effort is made to earn interest on fictitious capital, and the burden of the high transportation rates made necessary to provide for interest on a nominal capital perhaps double that actually invested, is thrown upon

producers. This is inequitable, for it obliges producers to pay a double interest on the money actually invested in our railroads. But if the uses of our railroads as agents in the enriching of the speculative cliques at the expense of the productive classes stopped here, the railroads would be of quite minor importance in the building up of oligarchy. Unfortunately, the use of our railroads as engines of speculation does not end here. It only begins here. The speculative cliques in building a new road or extending an old, invariably issue securities of a nominal value far in excess of the money invested. There is a real investment represented by first mortgage bonds, which are issued often at a discount of twenty per cent. or more, to those putting up the money to build the road. On top of this, stock or junior bonds are issued, often to an amount exceeding the sum of the first mortgage bonds, to the cliques financing the roads.

The first purpose of the speculative cliques is to find a market for these worthless securities. To make a market, the road must make real or apparent earnings sufficient to enable the payment of interest or dividends on this watered capital. This can only be done by raising freight rates or doctoring the books. But rates cannot be raised at once. Industries must first be induced to locate along the line of the road and time given for their development. So freight rates are first put low, and the industries getting the advantage of low rates, often much lower than can be obtained by their competitors located on other roads, prosper. Consequently, there comes an industrial growth along the new line, for industries located there are made peculiarly profitable. But these industries once located, the speculative cliques reverse their policy. They put up freight rates. The advantage possessed by such industries in the enjoyment of low freight rates disappears, and likewise their prosperity.

But, in the meanwhile, the earnings of the railroad increase, dividends are earned and paid on the watered securities, which are thus given the appearance of value. By a manipulation of quotations for such securities, the recording of fictitious sales at rapidly advancing figures, effort is made to excite the cupidity of the investing public. In this way a market for the fictitious securities is made and the cliques sell the stocks and bonds that cost them little or nothing, often at prices near to par, sometimes even above. While this is going on, one industry after another is driven into bankruptcy. The speculative cliques buy up the financially ruined properties at wreckage prices and then they set about to make these industries profitable and at the same time ruin the properties of individual producers. They do this by securing a rebate in freight charges, which enables them to get their raw materials and market their products at a less cost than their competitors. This gives them an advantage, enables them to undersell the independent producers paying higher rates, and still prosper. Inevitably the independent producers succumb to such competition. They must join the cliques or go under. The result is that out of railroad discrimination we have built up industrial trusts. We have industries wiped out here and built up there, the small towns declining while the large centres, to which the trust industries gravitate, are built up.

But this does not complete the picture. The reduction of freight rates, through the granting of rebates, of secret cuts and then open, undermines the earnings of the railroad. The road that earned and paid interest on fictitious capital no longer does so, the small investors see the securities which they bought at top figures depreciating, dividends are passed, interest defaulted, and then comes a receivership for the road. The investor outside of the cliques loses his all, as did the independent producer. Both have been robbed, that the speculative cliques might be enriched. The low freight rates prior to and following the receivership, making profitable the industries wrecked by high freight rates and bought by the cliques, the cliques take advantage of such circumstances to capitalize such industries and to sell the securities. Then they are ready to reorganize the



bankrupt railroad. They pare down old fictitious capital and issue new to themselves, as compensation for their services. And then they are ready to again go through the cycle of wrecking investors in industrial enterprises, and then investors in the new series of watered railroad securities, by which means they accumulate vast fortunes by depriving producers of their earnings and investors of their savings. It is thus that swings the gigantic see-saw by which our moneyed oligarchy is being built up, by which the speculative cliques trample on human rights and exalt the rights of property.

The use of our railroads in this direful way the Republican party has tolerated, even as it has championed the appreciating gold standard and the resulting enhancement of the riches of the few by the despoiling of the debtor classes. It has tolerated the trusts that have grown up under this system; it has permitted them to shelter themselves behind the protective system, and use the tariff duties imposed for the protection of our people as a vantage ground from which to oppress them. Thus has the Republican party become the champion of property rights, the aider and abettor of those trampling on human rights and building up an oligarchy of wealth, an oligarchy that threatens the sanctity of the ballot-box, imperils the freedom of elections, undermines our Republic, crushes liberty to earth.

We turn, then, from the Republican party as the defender of human rights. The Democratic party comes much nearer being the party of human liberty than the party that was organized to overthrow an oligarchy built on negro slavery, an oligarchy that enriched itself by despoiling 4,000,000 blacks of the fruits of their toil, but now champions and protects the moneyed oligarchy, an oligarchy preying on 70,000,000 of freemen, freemen from chattel slavery, despoiling them of the fruits of their toil and reducing them to the slavery of industrial poverty until the name freemen bids to become but a travesty on their condition.

The Democratic party has pledged itself to rectify the monetary system that, by increasing the burden of all debts, has led to the despoilment of our producing classes and the enrichment of the moneyed cliques, a system that the Republican party has championed. In so far the Democratic party has opposed itself to the trampling on human rights. It has thus far espoused the cause of the people. But at this it stops. It ignores the use of our railroads as speculative engines in the building up of the moneyed oligarchy, in the despoiling of our producing classes of the fruits of their toil, in the stifling of industries and the enslavement of our people to this oligarchy. It shows itself but a quasi protector of human rights as opposed to property rights. It stands against the dear dollar, it is fair to presume that it would give us a just dollar, a dollar that would not rob the debtor nor defraud the creditor, a dollar that would not stand in the way of the just distribution of wealth; it would take from our industrial trusts the shelter of tariff duties, but when it comes to protecting our people from despoilment at the hands of the speculative cliques, using the railroads as their weapon, it stands back. Therefore the Democratic party does not give our people the promise of full protection in the creation and enjoyment of wealth, does not promise to secure for all men an equal chance in the accumulation of wealth or in its use, does not therefore live up to the guiding principle of our institutions, does not show itself fitted to guard over a free people.

We must, then, look elsewhere for the party of the people. The Peoples party in its cardinal tenets comes up to the measurement. Yet the Peoples party cannot, as such, unite the defenders of human rights, and lead the way to victory. Within the party itself there is bitter discord, discord bred of unworthy jealousy, discord bred of mutual distrust of the

motives of well-meaning, patriotic men. Mere jealousy of leaders, the desire to equalize by pulling down rather than by building up is contemptible. Those who harbor it are unworthy of the great cause to which they profess to be attached with heart and soul. But that there should be distrust of leaders, even though such distrust be unmerited, is natural. The people have so often been betrayed by their chosen leaders that they are suspicious. There is also scattered among the leaders of the Populist movement a spirit of domineering that is the breeder of dissensions, fateful to union and success.

The Populist party is now on the eve of a split. The two wings should be harmonized and brought together, not by compromise, but by a mutual understanding that can come to men only when willing to grant to those who hold different views the same high motives for action as each man claims for himself. We are satisfied the discord among the defenders of human rights is the outcome of misunderstanding of motives and purposes rather than of real differences. If it is not so, sorry indeed is our country's plight, for discord must prove fatal.

For our part we own allegiance to no party, we care for no party name. THE AMERICAN supported the Republican party while it believed that party would best serve the interests of our country; it supported Garfield for president in 1880, and Harrison for president in 1888, believing from personal knowledge that those gentlemen would place the rights of man before the rights of property, that both were bimetalists. The first showed weakness at a critical time, the inception of his administration. He made mistakes that he later tried to rectify. His desire to do right cost him his life. The second was false to his professions. THE AMERICAN during those years aligned itself in general with the Republican party, though it led the independent movement in Pennsylvania in 1882, and again in 1890, that resulted in the election of a Democratic Governor. In 1892 there was no choice between the parties. Both candidates were acceptable to the moneyed cliques; both distasteful to those believing in the supremacy of human rights. In 1896 we gave our support to Mr. Bryan, not because we were satisfied with the platform of the Democratic party or its candidate, but because we saw in the rejuvenated Democratic party the promise of a brighter future, a ray of promise that it would become in whole, as it had in part, the champion of policies dictated by a regard for the rights of man.

Partisan we have never been and trust we never shall be, unless it be partisan, which it should never be in a republic, to espouse the rights of man, to consistently oppose those who trample on human rights. We seek the party of human rights and liberty, as opposed to property rights and industrial slavery; and care not by what name it goes. Our prayer is that the defenders of human rights may unite and make success possible. The Peoples party meets the measurement of that party, although we cannot but regard its demands, at times, ill-judged. Moreover, incapable of uniting all defenders of human rights, the Populist party is unfitted to undertake the defense. It cannot undertake it successfully. Populists may not see the reason of this, they may not see any obstacle to the union of the people's forces, of the defenders of human rights under the Populist name. But they must remember that the name Populist is as distasteful to upright Democrats, and Republicans who refused to follow the Republican party as the defender of oligarchy, as the name Democrat or Republican is to them. It may be unreasonable, but it is so, and why buck up needlessly against prejudice; why alienate defenders of human rights; why have discord and dissension because of a name? There is an imperative need for the defenders of Human Rights to unite in a new party. They cannot unite in an old. Yet if they do not unite, oligarchy will triumph. Well-wishers

of the Republic, believers in the equality of man, should not, then, hesitate.

We would suggest the AMERICAN PARTY as the name—a name we suggested in April a year ago, and the following as the platform upon which all defenders of Human Rights must agree and can unite:

1. Free coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 1 to 16.
2. The issue of all paper money, and the regulation of the volume thereof by the National Government.
3. Government ownership of railroads and telegraphs.

Let AMERICAN PARTY be the name; the party of human rights and liberty, as opposed to the party of oligarchy, property rights and industrial slavery, our cardinal tenet. We end as we began, by putting this question: Are human rights, liberty, to be crushed to earth, that property rights, a moneyed oligarchy, may be enthroned? It is *the* question before the American people.

#### RAILROAD AND NATION.

THE discrimination of our railroads among our own people, rendering better and cheaper transportation facilities to some industries than to others, is certainly bad enough, but what can be said of discrimination in favor of foreign producers and against our own industries, to a discrimination on the part of our railroads fostering the growth of foreign industries and stifling the growth of our own? Just one thing connected with the management of our railroads can be more intolerable than the stifling of one enterprise that others may benefit, the squeezing out of one industry by giving preferential rates, cheaper service to its competitors, and that is the stifling of all domestic industries, the injury of our own people for the benefit of foreigners, by giving foreigners lower rates for the transportation of their goods than our own people, by making it possible for them to market their products in our markets at a less cost than the products of our own people can be marketed.

The nation builds up a tariff for the protection of domestic industry against foreign competition, the railroads overturn, in a measure, such intended protection by making the foreigner lower transportation rates than those accorded to our own people, thus putting our producers at a disadvantage in the marketing of their products. That the railroads should thus deliberately tear down what the nation builds up could scarce be believed if it was not vouched for by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of which William R. Morrison, long time a representative in Congress from Illinois and a leader of the Democratic party on the floor of the House, is chairman.

It has been assumed that our producers are protected against foreign competition by location, that they have an advantage over their competitors in being located nearer to the markets for their products and being put to a less expense in the distribution of their goods. But of this advantage of location, this natural protection, the railroads have, in some instances, at least, deprived our people. Distance, the necessity of transporting products over three thousand miles or more of sea, besides a land carriage at each end, should put our European competitors under a handicap and give our producers the advantage that their location is supposed to confer, namely, a minimum expense in the marketing of their goods. But it has been proven, in more than one instance, that our railroads, working in conjunction with the trans-Atlantic steamship companies, have reversed this, giving to our European competitors the advantage conferred by a minimum expense in the marketing of products, and putting our people under the handicap of a maximum cost that should, of right, weigh on their foreign competitors.

That the private ownership and management of railroads should lead to such abuses is an unanswerable argument in favor of the governmental ownership of our transportation facilities.

That our industries have suffered from such abuses cannot be questioned. This discrimination of our railroads in favor of foreign shippers has been carried so far, in some instances, as not only to equalize distance so as to put the foreigner at no disadvantage because of his great distance from our markets, but so as, in effect, to bring him nearer to our markets than are our own producers. Though having to market his goods at a distance three or four times as great as our producers, though having to transport his goods three or four times the distance, he often suffers no disadvantage, for the through freight rate made him for this greater distance is at times actually made lower than the freight rates charged our own producers for transportation of goods one-fourth the distance. So it happens that where enjoying such discriminations, and many foreign shippers do enjoy such discriminations, the foreigner can market his goods at a less expense than can our own producers. Thus our railroads have handicapped our own industries.

It is true that ocean transportation is cheaper than land carriage, it is quite probable that freight can be carried three miles by water for the same expense that it can be carried one mile by land, and that transportation of 3000 miles across the Atlantic does not cost more than a land carriage of 1000 miles. But it must be remembered that in addition to this ocean carriage, the foreign manufacturer, making for our markets, is handicapped or would be under equitable conditions by a rail carriage at home, and, in general, a longer rail carriage in America than our own producers are subject to. Often he is not handicapped, for he is given a lower freight rate for the longer haul and shipment than our producers are for a shorter. The result is, of course, grievous to our producers, who are forced to contend with an unexpected competition. By the amount of the discrimination in favor of the foreign shippers is the protection extended to our producers, by our tariff system, impaired. It is with this help of our railroads that many foreign producers are enabled to surmount our tariff wall and continue to compete with our producers in our markets.

To what extent this discrimination in favor of foreign shippers, this undermining of our tariff system, is carried by our railroads is, of course, impossible to tell. They hide, they do not advertise the discriminations they make in favor of foreign shippers. But that they do so discriminate has been proven. It has been proven before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and before the United States Courts; the right of railroads, under the Interstate Commerce Act, to lawfully charge less for the transportation of import than of domestic traffic of like kind to the same destination has been denied by the Commission and affirmed by the Supreme Court, though not without dissent.

This question was raised in 1890, originally passed upon by the Commission in January, 1891, and adversely to the railroads; but the Texas and Pacific, one of the defendant roads, refused to comply with the order of the Commission. The Commission thereupon petitioned the United States District Court, for the southern district of New York, praying for the enforcement of the order. The prayer was granted by the court, the railroad appealed to the Circuit Court of Appeals, which affirmed the decree of the court below. The case was then carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, which reversed the orders of the lower courts, and affirmed the right of the railroad to discriminate in favor of foreigners and against our own people, to foster, by the charge of inequitable rates, the growth of foreign industries at the expense of our own.

The dissenting opinion of Justice Harlan, concurred in by Justice Brown, Chief Justice Fuller also dissenting, was vigorous. "Does anyone suppose," he wrote, "that if the Inter-state Commerce bill, as originally presented, had declared in express terms that an American railroad company might charge more for the transportation of American freight between two given places in this country than it charged for foreign freight between the



same points, that a single legislator would have sanctioned it by his vote? Does anyone suppose that an American president would have approved such legislation? Suppose the Inter-state Commerce bill, as originally reported, or when put upon its passage, had contained this clause: 'Provided, however, The carrier may charge less for transporting from an American port to any place in the United States freight received by it from Europe on a through bill of lading than it charges for American freight carried from that port to the same place for which the foreign freight is destined.' No one would expect such a bill to pass an American Congress. If not, we should not declare that Congress ever intended to produce such a result; especially when the act it has passed does not absolutely require it to be so interpreted."

But the majority of the Supreme Court decided that Congress did so intend and legalized discrimination on the part of our railroads in favor of foreign shippers and against our own producers, on the ground that it was necessary for the railroads to make such discriminations in favor of foreign producers in order to obtain the traffic. They might have gone a little further and affirmed that in order to enable foreign producers, handicapped by our tariff system, to compete in our markets, to surmount the tariff barriers raised by Congress as a protection against such competition, it was necessary that foreign producers should be encouraged by discrimination in freight rates, and that the granting of lower rates to foreigners than to our own people was therefore justified.

It was proven in the test case made by the Texas and Pacific Railroad, both before the Commission and the Court that the discrimination of freight charges in favor of foreign shippers was extreme. Thus it was shown that on books, buttons, carpets, clothing and hosiery, the domestic rate from New Orleans to San Francisco was \$2.88 per hundred pounds, while the total through charge on the same articles from Liverpool to San Francisco was only \$1.07 per hundred. And it was further shown that boots, shoes, cashmeres, cigars, confectionery, cutlery, gloves, hats, caps, laces, linen, linen goods, saddlers' goods and woolen goods were carried from Liverpool through New Orleans to San Francisco for \$1.07 per hundred pounds, though domestic commodities of the same kind were charged \$3.70 for the haul from New Orleans to the same destination. In other words, the British shipper could send goods to San Francisco at less than one-third the charge made to the New Orleans shipper. He could get his goods to the San Francisco market at one-third of the cost to the Louisiana shipper. Therein lies the advantage conferred on the foreign producer by railroad discrimination.

Commenting on this subject and the decision of the Supreme Court in the above case the Interstate Commerce Commissioners remark in their report for 1896, that: "Some difference between import and domestic rates might perhaps be allowed without serious injury to American interests; but when, for example, as we believe has actually and frequently happened, tin plate is carried from Swansea, Wales, to Liverpool, England, thence taken by steamer across the Atlantic and hauled by rail from one of our ports through Pittsburg, Pa., to Chicago, Ills., at a total through charge from origin to destination which is less than the published tariff on the same commodity from Pittsburg to Chicago, it requires no argument to show that legislative action should prevent such gross discriminations."

The Interstate Commerce Commission is right, but the one kind of legislative action that will remedy such injustice is legislation providing for the taking over of our railroads by the Government. We can only keep our tariff system intact and secure our people against the injustice of discrimination by assuming, as a nation, the ownership and control of our transportation facilities.

Man owes more to himself than he is willing to pay.

#### WOOL-GROWER AND WOOLEN MANUFACTURER.

IT IS with pleasure we give space to the following communication of Mr. Robert Dornan, one of Philadelphia's leading carpet manufacturers, and late President of the Manufacturers' Club:

To the Editor THE AMERICAN:

In your issue of May 8, there occur certain editorial remarks upon the tariff bill presented to the Senate, in which you state the measure is "an improvement over the Dingley tariff as it passed the House, because it gives more adequate protection to the agricultural interests."

How you can reconcile the statement in view of the decrease of three cents per pound on the duties on the first and second class wools which enter directly into competition with and displace our home grown wools by advancing the argument "that compensation is made for such reduction by increasing the rates on carpet wools," which do not compete nor displace home-grown wools even to the extent of five per cent. of the total amount imported, is a mystery to me.

Your statement that the changing of the form of duty on carpet wools from *ad valorem* to specific "would close some very serious loopholes to fraud," and further alleging that "the fraud of entering carpet wools as clothing wools was freely practiced under the McKinley tariff," is absolutely without foundation and entirely unsusceptible of proof.

Believing you have accepted such statements as facts without seeking their verification, thereby unwittingly and unintentionally raising doubts as to the integrity of the importers and users of carpet wools, it is but right that you should qualify the statement.

Further, how you can reconcile the idea that increased duties on carpet wools which do not compete with those grown by our farmers can advantage them, when, as consumers of carpets, they must pay the additional duties, I am at a loss to comprehend.

Being no less anxious than yourself to improve conditions for the agricultural classes, and recognizing that unless they have the purchasing power as consumers, manufacturing industry must continue to languish; it is clearly apparent that excessive duties on carpet wools which will increase the cost of ingrain carpets twenty cents per yard (upon the manufacturers' selling price of forty cents) are not compatible with what is best for the farmers' interest.

Very respectfully,

ROBERT DORNAN.

When Mr. Dornan quotes us as stating that the Senate tariff bill is "an improvement over the Dingley tariff, as it passed the House, because it gives more adequate protection to the agricultural interests," he hardly does us justice. We do not regard the wool and woolen schedule of the Senate bill as a model. On the contrary, we regard it as most inequitable and as extending most inadequate protection to the wool-grower. Much less are we satisfied with the Republican party's treatment of our agricultural classes, as exemplified by the pending tariff bill. The placing of tariff duties on agricultural products we do not import, but export largely, is folly. The offering to our farmers of protection in this guise is mere deception, it is offering them a stone when they ask for bread. What is more, farmers fed on stones, fed on the promise of protection, cannot purchase manufactured goods. They want the reality, not the shadow. The hope, the expectation, of better times will not enable our farmers to increase their purchases of manufactures, or manufacturers to more readily dispose of their goods. The hope must first materialize, and it never will materialize while our farmers are obliged to sell their produce, as they must be, so long as we adhere to the gold standard, in competition with peoples enjoying a bonus on their exports of 100 per cent. or more in the shape of a premium on gold.

Yet we look upon the agricultural schedules of the Senate bill, mere shams as for the most part they are, as an improvement over those of the Dingley tariff in that they provide for the placing of hides on the dutiable list and the raising of duties on the third-class wools, misnamed carpet wools. The reduced rates of duty on first and second-class wools, provided for in the Senate bill as compared to those provided for in the original Dingley bill, would most assuredly extend to the wool-grower less protection than that extended by these schedules as they passed the House and in this the Senate bill must be less satisfactory to the wool-grower. But the raising of the duty on

carpet wools from the low *ad valorem* rate of 32 per cent., equivalent to a duty of about 2.6 cents a pound, as provided for in the House bill, to a minimum specific duty of 4 cents, and a maximum of 7 cents a pound would, we believe, confer a greater measure of protection on the wool-grower than that lost through the reduction in the rates on first and second-class wools. We say this because the so-called carpet wools enter largely into the manufacture of woollen goods and hence come into competition with our clothing wools. Further, Mr. Dornan raises the point that we do not raise our carpet wools. But that is not the question. The question is, can we? The same argument might have been advanced against putting a duty on tin plates and on numerous other articles that we did not produce at the time of the imposition of tariff duties. Such arguments have been advanced by free traders, but not by protectionists.

Our comment on the woollen schedule of the Senate bill in our issue of May 8, and to which Mr. Dornan takes exception, was as follows:

"Though the changes made in the tariff bill by the Republican members of the Senate Finance Committee have been many, the bill, as reported to the Senate, is but little, if any, improved over that passed by the House. In some particulars it has been improved, in others it has been made doubly repugnant to true protectionists. In a word, the remodelled bill is more considerate of the agricultural interests than the old, which is good; but it is also more considerate of one, at least, of our great industrial trusts, which is bad."

And then we further commented in these words:

"As we have said, the tariff bill, as presented to the Senate, is an improvement over the Dingley tariff as it passed the House, in that it gives more adequate protection to the agricultural interests. But there is still plenty of room for improvement. This is especially the case with the wool schedule, for, despite the changes made, the protection extended is inadequate, and the schedule is made with a crudity and a shameful disregard of the various conditions in which wool is imported, such as must deprive wool-growers of a great part of the nominal protection given them. To begin with, the rates on clothing wools are reduced from 11 and 12 cents per pound, proposed in the House bill, to 8 and 9 cents, but compensation is made for these reductions in an increase in the proposed duty on carpet wools from 32 per cent. *ad valorem*, equivalent to an average of about 2.6 cents a pound, to a specific duty of 4 cents on wools of less value than 10 cents, and 7 cents on third-class wools of a greater value. This is a decided improvement, for it would close, in a measure, some very serious loopholes to fraud, making it less advantageous to enter clothing wools under the head of carpet wools, as was done so freely under the McKinley tariff."

Since the receipt of Mr. Dornan's letter we have consulted a number of carpet manufacturers, dealers in both domestic and imported wools, and experts. The general consensus of opinion obtained in this way confirms the truth of the statement in THE AMERICAN, to which Mr. Dornan takes exception. There seems to be no doubt that at least 15 per cent. of wools imported as carpet wools, are used for clothing and upholstery. Some seemingly reliable reports place the percentage of wools imported as carpet wools, and used for other purposes than making carpets, at 25, 40 and 50 per cent. That much more wool, classified as third-class, misnamed carpet wools, would be imported for use in the manufacture of clothing if an incentive to such importations was held out, as it would be should the original Dingley bill be enacted, cannot be questioned. With wool of all kinds on the free list, there is, of course, no incentive to the importation of the wools used in the manufacture of clothing as third-class wools, and that wools so imported are now largely used in the manufacture of woollens is due to the fact that under present conditions much clothing is manufactured out of the cheaper and coarser wools. Put a high tariff rate on first and second-class wools, and a mere revenue rate on third-class wools, and we might naturally expect a very extended use of third-class wools in the manufacture of clothing.

Judge Lawrence, President of the National Wool Growers' Association, writing us under date of May 20th, from Bellfontaine,

Ohio, pertinently remarks: "Does any man believe that from 90,000,000 to 140,000,000 pounds of third-class wools are used in making carpets each year? You can learn in your city how much of carpets are made up annually of all kinds—about 70,000,000 yards, I think.—Most of them are made largely of a little new wool, some cotton, some shoddy and even cow and calf hair as you will see by dissecting some cheap carpets. There is not an average of  $\frac{1}{2}$  a pound of new wool in a yard of carpet."

A gentleman living in Philadelphia, probably the highest authority, says that 164 pounds of dyed yarn are used in each piece of 133 yards of extra super carpet divided as follows:

38 lbs.	.....	Worsted
86 lbs.	.....	Double Reel
40 lbs.	.....	Grey Yarn
164 lbs.		

In carpets known as "union carpets" probably less than one pound of wool is used in each yard of carpet. How the rates of duties proposed in the Senate tariff bill could increase the cost (as Mr. Dornan says) of ingrain carpet by 20 cents a yard, we are, in view of the fact that not more than 1 pound of wool goes into a yard of carpet, on the average, and that the proposed rate of duty on carpet wools is but 4 cents per pound, unable to understand.

The extent of the present use of carpet wools in the manufacture of clothing and upholstery will be made clear by a perusal of the following bald facts. They need no comment.

When looms of all kinds in Pennsylvania are run to full capacity, the annual production of carpets of all kind is about 43,000,000 yards, and in the rest of the country about 27,000,000 yards, a total of 70,000,000.

Imports of Class 3 wools (carpet wools), for the fiscal years ending June 30th, were as follows:

1891	.....	90,405,690 lbs.
1892	.....	92,581,282 lbs.
1893	.....	122,386,072 lbs.
1894	.....	42,918,584 lbs.
1895	.....	105,405,649 lbs.
1896	.....	97,921,715 lbs.
		551,618,992 lbs.

Here we have a total amount of carpet wool imported in six years of 551,618,992 pounds, an average of 91,936,499 pounds. Now, if it takes but a pound of wool on the average to make a yard of carpet, our carpet mills running full time would consume but 70,000,000 pounds of carpet wool, or nearly 22,000,000 pounds less than the average importation. But the carpet looms have not been running anything like full time, and the wool used in the past two years for making carpets probably did not exceed two-thirds of the normal, say 47,000,000 pounds. Therefore, of the annual importations of wools classified as carpet wools and averaging 91,936,499 pounds, an average of more than 44,000,000 pounds must have been used during the past two years for other purposes, to wit, clothing and upholstery, or have remained unused.

Professor C. H. Thurber, of the University of Chicago, has obtained from 3,000 children, of ages from 6 to 15, inclusive, in the public schools of Chicago, answers to questions, two of which are as follows: What books have you read since school began last September? Which one of these did you like best? The second book on the list is "Uncle Tom's Cabin," and Longfellow's "Evangeline" stands No. 13, while many books especially prepared for children come in toward the end of the list. John Fiske's "History of the United States," is No. 15 on a list of 100 books receiving the greatest number of votes. This book also appears in the first ten voted for by boys of 13 and 14 years old.



## WOMAN'S WAYS.

OVER and over again,  
No matter which way I turn,  
I always find in the Book of life  
Some lesson I have to learn;  
I must take my turn at the mill,  
I must grind out the golden grain,  
I must work at my task with a resolute will,  
Over and over again.

We cannot measure the need  
Of even the tiniest flower,  
Nor check the flow of the golden sands  
That run through a single hour,  
But the morning dew must fall,  
And the sun and summer rain  
Must do their part, and perform it all  
Over and over again.

Over and over again  
The brook through the meadows flows,  
And over and over again  
The ponderous mill-wheel goes;  
Once doing will not suffice,  
Though doing be not in vain,  
And a blessing, failing us once or twice,  
May come if we try again.

The path that has once been trod  
Is never so rough to the feet,  
And the lesson we once have learned  
Is never so hard to repeat;  
Though sorrowful tears may fall,  
And the heart to its depths be riven  
With storm and tempest, we need them all  
To render us meet for heaven.

—Josephine Pollard.

Of the 451 colleges and universities in this country, only forty-one are closed to women. But, to make up for this lack, there are 143 schools of higher learning open to women only, and having 30,000 students. The *University Courier* says: "Will it not soon be time to raise the question why men should be shut out from the advantages of these 143 schools of higher education which now are open to women only? Forty-one institutions are closed to women and 143 are closed to men. Why?"

Nearly 4,000,000 women, or 18 per cent. of all women in the United States, were in 1890 engaged in earning their own living in some trade or employment.

The common objection among womankind to letting their age be known is not shared by the ladies of Japan, who actually display their cycle of years in the arrangement of their hair. Girls from 9 to 15 wear their hair interlaced with red crape in a semi-circle around the head, the forehead being left free with a curl at each side. From the ages of 15 to 30 the hair is dressed very high on the forehead and gathered up at the back in the shape of a butterfly or fan, with twistings of silver cord, and perhaps a decoration of colored balls. Beyond the milestone of 30 a woman twists her hair around a shell pin placed horizontally at the back of the head. Quite differently, again, a widow arranges her coiffure, and the initiated are able to tell at a glance whether she desires to marry again or not.

Arabian laws of loveliness say that to be beautiful a woman's physique must tally exactly with the following schedule: Her hair, eyebrows, lashes and pupils must be black; skin, teeth and globe of the eye, white; head, neck, ankles, arms and waist, round; back, fingers, arms and limbs long; forehead, eyes and lips large; eyebrows, nose and feet narrow; ears, bust and hands small.

Women have certainly become a factor in the money-making world, and there are no arguments weighty enough to convince the advanced woman of the day that she is not fitted for any walk in life which is sought by educated men as a means of earning a living. Farming as an occupation for women may not sound attractive to ladies of culture and refinement, but it has been demonstrated by three young women in Illinois that it is both a lucrative and enjoyable business for the gentler sex, and also that they need not lose their taste for the finer things of life in this humble employment. They believe that woman can properly manage any business if she is trained for it and will closely observe all the details and attend to it herself. Experience has

taught them that agents were not a success, as they very soon began to trade on the supposed incapability of women as business managers and tried to deceive them by charging for work which was never done. Their farms, which aggregate 4200 acres, were inherited from their father, John D. Gillett, a well-known man of Logan county, nine years ago.

These young women, practical agriculturists, having picked up much of their knowledge going over the farms with their father, and disgusted with their agents, took charge of their own farms. For the first few years after they assumed the management they devoted their entire time to the farms, and now the land yields twice as much as it did at the time of their father's death. Corn is their principal product, and the average yield is sixty bushels an acre. They have drained a lake of 400 acres by digging a ditch a mile and a half long. The farms are divided into small sections, which are tilled by tenants with whom they divide the crops. These women ride thirty and forty miles a day on their tours of inspection, which are not at stated times, so the tenants have no way of knowing when they are coming. Miss Nina Gillett says there is no work she would prefer to farming, and thinks a woman who has a knowledge of the subject and some experience is just as good a farmer as a man. Miss Amy is quite as much in love with the business, and, while they believe in all the science which can be applied to agriculture, they rarely indulge in experiments, but trust to the "Agricultural Experiment Stations" to enlighten them as to what may or may not be done with land.

## WORDS OF WISDOM.

THERE is no unbelief.  
Whoever plants a seed beneath the sod,  
And waits to see it push away the clod,  
He trusts in God.

Whoever says, when clouds are in the sky,  
"Be patient, heart, light breaketh by-and-by,"  
Trusts the Most High.

Whoever sees 'neath winter's field of snow  
The silent harvest of the future grow,  
God's power must know.

Whoever lies down on his couch to sleep,  
Content to lock each sense in slumber deep,  
Knows God will keep.

Whoever says "To-morrow," "the Unknown,"  
"The future," trusts the Power alone  
He dares disown.

The heart that looks on when eyelids close,  
And dares to live when life has only woes,  
God's comfort knows.

There is no unbelief,  
And day by day, and night, unconsciously,  
The heart that lives by faith the lips deny,  
God knoweth why!

—Edward Bulwer Lytton.

Consider that our anger and impatience often prove much more mischievous than the things about which we are angry or impatient.—*Marcus Aurelius*.

Believe nothing against another but on good authority; nor report what may hurt another, unless it be a greater hurt to others to conceal it.

Beware of the sin whose only defence is that it is highly respectable.

If you would be nothing, just wait to be something.

All government, indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue, and every prudent act, is founded on compromise and barter. We balance inconvenience; we give and take; we remit some rights that we may enjoy others, and we choose rather to be happy citizens than subtle disputants. As we must give away some natural liberty, to enjoy civil advantages, so we must sacrifice some civil liberties, for the advantages to be derived from the communion and fellowship of a great empire. But, in all fair dealings, the thing bought must bear some proportion to the purchase paid. None will barter away the immediate jewel of his soul.—*Edmund Burke*.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

NEW LIGHT ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE GREATER NORTH-WEST. Henry-Thompson Journals. Edited with copious critical commentary by Elliott Coues. New York: Francis P. Harper. 3 vols. \$10.

The work entailed in this book could have fallen to no one more eminently fitted for it than to Dr. Coues, whose research and study in work of a closely analogous character, in a somewhat similar, if different field, had already qualified and equipped him in large measure for that which confronted him when he undertook this. Therefore, we take up this book in the full expectation of finding the work complete in every particular, and as we turn page by page we feel that our confidence was not misplaced. Evidence is abundant of the most diligent, careful, painstaking and exhaustive work, made the more satisfactory by reason of the thorough personal familiarity with the geography and character of much of the country covered. If the work shall seem to verge on laboriousness, by reason of its very fullness even to the most trivial circumstances, it must be remembered that it is not intended for general reading, and that this very fact is what gives it a distinctive value as a record of historical events, sociological facts and geographical information which must prove of the utmost value to the historian, and of the first importance to all others who desire to investigate an almost inaccessible field. The narrative will sustain a lively interest throughout.

The text of this work consists of the journal of Alexander Henry covering the period 1799-1814. The original manuscript seems, unfortunately, to have been lost, but the journal exists as a manuscript copy (now in the Government Library at Ottawa) made in 1824, of which "the identification and authenticity . . . are established beyond peradventure of a doubt." In preparing this for publication it was deemed advisable to edit and considerably condense the copy, which, in fact, was largely rewritten, as explained in the preface. Referring to this, Dr. Coues says: "Despite the very great reduction and other modification to which the manuscript has necessarily been subjected in passing through my hands, I do not think that I have omitted or obscured a single matter of fact of the slightest significance, or subordinated the author's individuality to my own. I have caused him to tell his own story as plainly as he evidently wished to tell it. . . . I can vouch for its inviolate fidelity to fact throughout. . . . There is not, to my knowledge, a single statement in the book that can be seriously questioned on the score of veracity."

Preceding, accompanying and following Henry, working his way through an even wider range, went David Thompson, who, as explorer and discoverer, devoted his life in those parts rather to science than to trade. His valuable records, from 1789 to 1812, have been largely drawn upon for confirmation and exemplification, and the result of his labors has been woven into the present work in a way to make him figure prominently in it, especially during the last eight years covered by the narrative. Here we would remark the three reduced fac-simile outline maps, traced from the original "Map of the North-West Territory of the Province of Canada," to be found in the last volume of the present work. This map by Thompson has interest, not alone nor chiefly because to him belongs the distinction of being the discoverer of the head waters of the Columbia river, but because of its general and approximate correctness, the more noteworthy considering the difficulties which must have surrounded its making, it being to all purposes the first map of a vast and until then almost unexplored and unknown expanse of territory.

In following the Henry-Thompson trails we are taken from Lake Superior through Manitoba, Assiniboia, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, and in the United States through Minnesota, Dakota, Oregon, etc., obtaining, apart from historical information, a very full and clear understanding of the geography of that great section, so rich in natural resources, and which is destined to play a highly important part in the future.

A hardy pioneer in a rough country unpeopled save by still rougher natives, exposed to all the hardships of the elements, battling often for bare existence, absolutely barred during long months from all communication with the outside world, seeing scarcely a white man but was a hated rival, Henry, a close observer and careful recorder of observations, facts and passing events, has left a record of much that went to make the early history of the great section of the North American continent in

which his life work was done; a history he had large share in creating. Thanks to the exertions of him whose assiduity rescued this chronicle from the oblivion in which it has lain hidden, and which tireless research has enabled him to present in the clear light of his own understanding of the country and its history, this united Henry-Thompson-Coues work will "take its rightful place among the most important contributions" to the early history of the Greater Northwest following the advent of the white man on the scene. While we have practically no means of checking it up and so proving for ourselves the accuracy of the work, we have no hesitation in accepting it as correct, and no one who reads the book with any care can lay it down other than with the conviction that it is entirely reliable and accurate.

Henry was an active member of the North West Company, long the most powerful competitor and rival of the Hudson Bay Company. Therefore his life was first of all commercial, and it is interesting to note how this affected his mind and general views of things. With him, as with other fur traders, the beaver-skin was the article in great request,—practically it was their measure of value, and in reading this journal we cannot but remark the very potent influence it exerted in their reckoning of relative values of different sections of country, and their estimate of qualities and characteristics and hence comparative desirability of the several Indian tribes with whom they came in contact.

It is almost a matter of supererogation to speak of the Indians and what they were, at this time, when the race, dwindled almost to the point of extinction, can never again play any part in the history of America, but as they and their wrongs, real and imagined, command a certain sentimental sympathy and championship, and as they did hold a very prominent place in the lives of those pioneers whose adventures and works form the subject of the book under discussion, it is only proper some mention should be made of them,—a human race whose history presents a striking example of Nature's law of "survival of the fittest." Whatever opinion we may have held as to inherent good qualities and the better side of Indians is not enhanced by the insight here obtained into their habits, practices and manner of life. Admitting that to association with the white man may justly be attributed the introduction of many vices, among them the use of intoxicants,—which, strange as it may seem, were apparently unknown to the aboriginal North American Indian,—and also the exaggeration of many others that already existed among them, and making every allowance for this factor in their debasement, we can find but little to really commend them and are forced to the inevitable conclusion that the race is not only an inferior one, but far down in the scale. Some tribes were undoubtedly greatly above others in civilization and mental and moral progress, but these comparatively bright spots only throw into bolder relief the low standing of the race as a whole.

And, as to the demoralizing effect of association with the white man, we see exemplified here in the Indian the result which is always evolved where a higher and psychologically better equipped race comes into close contact with a lower. The vices and all undesirable characteristics are readily and quickly assimilated and generally carried to excess, but while these are acquired, even to the destruction of the best that was previously possessed, and retrogression follows on this score, the lower mind and civilization is slow to acquire those characteristics and qualities which gives the higher its power and superiority, and so, while on the one side the tendency towards debasement is strong, on the other there is lacking the inherent strength necessary to resist it, and the consequence is a constantly widening gap between the higher, advancing, and the lower, declining, civilization.

No notice of this book would be fair that did not directly mention the publisher, who deserves great credit and commendation for the courage and enterprise evinced in backing a work of its character for which the demand must be limited and the original outlay necessarily very heavy.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND ENGLISH LITERATURE. By Edward Dowden. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.25.

Professor Dowden is, or should be, a favorite guide, philosopher and friend to every anxious inquirer into the deeper meanings of our literature. His "Mind and Art of Shakespeare" and his "Life of Shelley" are indispensable to students of those widely sundered poets. Princeton University did well in honoring Professor Dowden and itself by inviting him to share in its recent one hundred and fiftieth anniversary to which he contributed the lectures which form this book. Its chapters are



"The Literary Precursors of Revolution," "The Theorists," "Edmund Burke and the Anti-Revolution Spirit." The other three chapters deal with "The Early Revolutionary Poets and Antagonists," "Recovery and Reaction," and "The Renewed Revolutionary Advance."

The author's object is to "enter in a disinterested way into the spirit of each writer who comes within the scope of my subject and to let the meanings of the French revolution, as they entered into English literature, expound themselves." In the course of these pages we are given a number of interesting thumb-nail sketches of the characters of that romantic period, Wilberforce, the abolitionist; Howard, the prison reformer; Fox, Pitt and Burke; and it is curious to note the whirl of revolutionary sympathy in young Fox, Southey and Landor, in casting off the courtly costume, cocked hat, red heeled shoes, blue hair-powder and silver buckles, for the short cropped hair and shoe ties of the vulgar herd. He claims Cowper as a revolutionist, which will rather startle the remnant who still find in that true poet one of the sweetest influences in all pure literature. Mr. Dowden explains that the claim is made less by virtue of his ardor on behalf of political liberty, genuine as that was, than by his feeling for simplification and his humanitarian sentiment. In this lies Cowper's title to a wider reading in these days of luxury. Whatever goes to make the ideal republic, Cowper eloquently pleaded for, royalist though he was. "I love my country, I love my king, and I wish peace and prosperity to old England." Yet he preached the brotherhood of man, upheld the cause of the slave, foresaw in commerce the great civilizing influence, bringing nations into fraternal intercourse from which flows sympathy. And, with Goldsmith, he eloquently deprecated the ruin of village life by the invasion of city luxury. Judging these preachers as poets and not economists, their exquisite sympathy with the poor and protests against display for display's sake, they figure in the history of English literature as seers whom it would have been well to heed.

We pass now to chapter four, which is notable for the prominence it gives to Burns. Burns died four years before Cowper, and three years after the Revolution. The author is quite right in saying that Burns was a European, rather than a national poet. Nevertheless, it is a ticklish question to settle. It may be, that we shall incur the penalties of heresy in our criticism of the possibly exaggerated homage done to the Scotch poet by his admirers, of whom Professor Dowden is one of the sanest. He says, if Burns admired the old ballads, it did not profoundly influence his art; his imagination was less romantic than passionate. The popular songs, often wedded to melodies gay or pathetic and penetrating, sank into his spirit and became part of his inmost self. Professor Dowden bespeaks large toleration in judging Burns' coarser productions. He could not be other than he was, a roystering young countryman in full exuberance of the spirit of the time, which to him and his kind meant—down with everything that is up, and up with everything that is down. Professor Dowden says, "The poetry of Burns is more than Scottish," on which we suggest that much of it was less than Scottish by the letter c. That Burns took strong fits of revolutionary enthusiasm is true; he also had his spasms of gushing loyalty, even to the titled gentry of the country side. In addressing "the Noblemen and Gentlemen of the Caledonian Hunt" he asks, "Where shall the bard so properly look for patronage as to the illustrious names of his native land, those who bear the honors and inherit the virtues of their ancestors? . . . May corruption shrink at your kindling indignant glance and may tyranny in the Ruler and licentiousness in the People equally find you an inexorable foe." This was written when he was thirty. The following verse he wrote a year before his death:

The wretch that wad a tyrant own,  
And the wretch, his true-born brother,  
Who would set the mob above the throne,  
May they be damned together!  
Who will not sing, "God save the King,"  
Shall hang as high's the steeple;  
But while we sing "God save the King,"  
We'll n'er forget the People.

One of his most exquisite laments was for the Earl of Glencairn. That Burns was a whole-hearted sympathizer with and advocate of his own fellow poor is shown in a hundred ways in his writings, but this does not constitute, in our judgment, sufficient ground for ranking him among the literary forces of the revolution period. He was a butterfly flickering from bloom to bloom in the garden of delights when we view him in his finest aspect, that of the lyric singer; again, he is a bee buzzing around

the noses of the Presbyterian elders, finding sweet sport in answering their protests with a sting.

But we have never been able to regard him as a bull dog guarding the cottagers' rights, much less as a fighting champion for the people's cause. His volatile nature forbade any lasting stability, at least in his serious departures, which is to say, he was a poet, a rural poet, far from the haunts of prosaic city-folk and sophisticated politicians.

Perhaps it may be near the mark to opine that the popular estimate of Burns as a serious poet crowns him as the singer of Equality. Indeed, this is Professor Dowden's view: "It is especially as the poet of Equality that Burns belongs to the Revolution." If the great multitude were polled, they would undoubtedly single out "A man's a man for a' that," as the inspired message above all others. This well-known song may be profitably compared with the extracts above. We observe, not without a smile of content, that Professor Dowden skims lightly over this belauded poem. It could not be ignored in a lecture on this subject which also deals with Burns; perhaps he wished it could. Its philosophy is of the shallow order, all but inevitable in a roysterer who revelled in chanting the carousings of "The Jolly Beggars" (by far his best poem), "Tam o'Shanter," and his escapades in love and drink. There is nothing unmanly in feeling a lofty shame for "honest poverty;" only a brave man feels the sting of being poor. "The coward slave" endures it contentedly. "The rank is but the guinea stamp;" yes, but without the stamp its worth is less.

A lump of clay may become a useful brick or a portrait bust. There are other "ranks" than those of mere title. Burns forgot this under the afflatus, though he had full appreciation of the latter. "Gie fools their silks and knaves their wine, A man's a man for a' that." Even in Burns' day, even in Burns' house at one time, silks and wine gave joy to the anti-luxury man, who was not necessarily fool or knave, and the poet knew of one man who played both fool and knave under the plebeian inspiration of whiskey. "The honest man, tho' e'er sae poor, Is king o' men for a' that." Pope puts it that "An honest man's the noblest work of God." As these lines stand, they are the veriest nonsense. Much mischief, we might almost say the totality of religious, political and social squabbings, is caused by lack of definitions. Genius, talent, perseverance, self-sacrifice are nobler than the virtue of honesty, which is a sort of negative or conventional virtue, with cowardice, often called prudence, for its root. It is also, of course, a principle with many. A more meaningful saying than those above is the worldly-wise maxim which makes honesty a paying policy. And so we might trail through the other stanzas without finding more than the jingling platitudes which set rustic politicians rattling their glasses in the village pot-houses of Scotland a hundred years ago, and in the saloons of congested cities the wide world over to-day.

Professor Dowden's lucid and dignified style always gives great pleasure. This book is well-printed, but there is no excuse for economizing on an index in a book of this calibre, every page of which bristles with names and incidents. We take the following from his chapter on Burke:

"Trained to public life as a member of the Whig party of the eighteenth century, Burke, in his sympathies, was aristocratical. He speaks of the people as a venerable object; but it was a disciplined, ordered people that he regarded with veneration; in the people reduced to a mob of jarring atoms he saw only a dis-banded race of deserters and vagabonds. 'For awhile they may be terrible, indeed, but in such manner as wild beasts are terrible. The mind owes to them no sort of submission.' Here is the explanation of the words which roused such strong indignation among Burke's opponents, and which were so often turned against him—'the swinish multitude.' The multitude, according to Burke, is not swinish while it forms a true people; then it is venerable and mysteriously sacred; but a disorganized mob is not the people; it is a 'disbanded race of deserters;' it may soon acquire the rapacity, the ferocity, the dullness, the grossness of the beast. For the sake not of a class, but of the whole people, he estimated highly the value of what he terms a natural aristocracy; he views such an aristocracy not as a separate interest in the State, nor as separable from it. Its origin is in nature, and in the facts of social life which are a part of nature: 'To be bred in a place of estimation; to see nothing low or sordid from one's infancy; to be taught to respect oneself; to be habituated to the censorial inspection of the public eye; to look early to public opinion; to stand upon such elevated ground as to be enabled to take a large view of the widespread and infinitely diversified combinations of men and affairs in a large society; to have leisure to read, to reflect, to converse; to be enabled to draw the court and attention of the wise and learned wherever they are to be found; to be habituated in armies, to command and to obey; to be taught to despise dangers in the pursuit of honor and duty; to be formed to the greatest degree of vigilance, foresight and circumspection, in a state of things in which no fault is committed with impunity, and the slightest mistakes draw on the most ruinous consequences; to be led to a guarded and regulated conduct, from a sense that you are considered an instructor of your fellow-citizens in their highest concerns, and that you act as reconciler between God and man; to be employed as an

administrator of law and justice, and to be thereby amongst the first benefactors of mankind; to be a professor of high science or of liberal and ingenuous art; to be amongst rich traders who from their success are presumed to have sharp and vigorous understandings, and to possess the virtues of diligence, order, constancy, and regularity, and to have cultivated an habitual regard to commutative justice—these are the circumstances of men which form, what I should call, a *natural* aristocracy, without which there is no nation."

"Even the prejudices created by rank and station were not viewed with entire disfavor by Burke. 'That a man should be looked up to with servility and awe,' wrote Godwin in 'Political Justice,' 'because the king has bestowed on him a spurious name, or decorated him with a ribbon; that another should wallow in luxury, because his ancestor three centuries ago bled in the quarrel of Lancaster and York,—do we imagine that these iniquities can be practiced without injury?' Such a violent outcry against aristocracy Burke took to be a mere work of art. 'To be honored,' he says, 'and even privileged by the laws, opinions, and inveterate usages of our country, growing out of the prejudice of ages, has nothing to provoke horror or indignation in any man.' For even in prejudices there lay, as Burke conceived, a certain sanctity and a certain utility. He boldly asserts that he will cherish old prejudices for the reason that they are old. The long life of a prejudice argues in favor of its containing some latent wisdom: 'We are afraid to put men to live and trade each on his own private stock of reason, because we suspect that the stock in each man is small, and that the individuals would do better to avail themselves of the general bank and capital of nations and of ages. Many of our men of speculation, instead of exploding general prejudices, employ their sagacity to discover the latent wisdom which prevails in them.' Even from superstition resources may be derived for the public advantage—that is to say, not from the untruths of superstition, but from its hidden truth. The movement of thought in the nineteenth century has been along the line indicated by Burke; the Revolutionary rage against the past beliefs of mankind has given place to an historical study of their origins and their significance."

#### ABOUT BOOKS AND WRITERS.

For the past year or so papers, professing to be literary, give their principal pages to talk about criticism, instead of to criticism. The meaning of it all amounts to this, they cannot induce independent critics to prostitute their office to the glorification of this or that newly discovered youthful genius. A literary weekly comes to hand to-day with its principal page filled with gush about the latest find, with his portrait stuck in the middle as if he were somebody, and the front page filled with an absurd boom of the young fellow's book by a hired writer, who signs his name. And yet there is not a single instance during the last ten years of the survival of these victims of unwise kindness.

There is really no kindness in it. It is sheer shop, faking-up immature authors, as if they had earned fame, to catch the floating dollar.

\*\*\*

Anything in the way of notoriety is used, even it be a low street brawl that finds its way into the police courts. These young men are sent out to the wars, and, greenhorns as they are, they seem to believe that this sort of puffery will give them an easy supremacy over the experienced correspondents who made their reputation on the battlefields of the seventies. A Western writer says:

"Criticism that is not sympathetic, suggestive, calculated to be of service to the author criticised, is not criticism at all. But if the authors persist in calling a spade a spade, and all of them nowadays, especially the youngest, insist upon that with the passion of patriots defending their birthright against the invader, they must not decline upon 'meagre efforts,' because the poor critic calls rubbish rubbish."

\*\*\*

Miss Emilie Grace Briggs bears the distinction of being the first woman who ever received a diploma from the Union Theological Seminary. She was a member of the class that graduated on May 18th, on the occasion of the sixty-first anniversary and commencement of the Seminary, in Adams Chapel. But Miss Briggs' honors do not stop there: she carried off first honors as well, passing all the men, and was the first to receive the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, conferred for the first time time by the Seminary. The young lady, who is in her twenty-first year, is a daughter of Prof. Charles A. Briggs of the Seminary faculty.

\*\*\*

The Golden-Booke Press of Evanston, Ill., has just published the "Autobiography of a Pocket-Handkerchief," by James Fenimore Cooper, edited, with notes and an introduction, by Walter Lee Brown, being a reissue, collated from the original manuscript of an almost unknown novel by Cooper, which has not been published for nearly sixty years. It first appeared in the United States in 1843, as a serial, then as a pamphlet (practically

unobtainable now), finally in book form in England only. No collected edition has ever included it. The fact that this is the first American edition in book-form will recommend the book still further to collectors.

\*\*\*

T. Y. Crowell & Co. have nearly ready an interesting book on modern France. It is by Baron de Coubertin, and is entitled "The Evolution of France Under the Third Republic." Isabel F. Hangood translates it:

Speaking of literature, he severely arraigns its morals: "The gate of immorality," he declares, "was thrown open by a poet of rare attraction, whose influence has since been immense and general. Everybody who knows how to read has been affected thereby. Alfred de Musset's work has served as the book of devotions—one might also say the breviary—of a whole generation. It contains poison for all ages and all natures—for the simple and the refined, for youth and mature age."

\*\*\*

Under the Second Empire "writers of genius sought a publisher; only the writers of romance found one. The sickly analysis of physical love infested the romance; debauch and adultery served as the theme of all tales. Poisonous substances cannot be absorbed with impunity. The higher classes became rapidly corrupt. Good and evil were constrained to live in contemptible promiscuity. Ideas became gangrened. The strangest theories were admitted, especially in educational matters. Certain errors of conduct were considered as a salutary experience for young men, and the indulgence which was publicly proclaimed with regard to those who thus learned 'to know life' was mingled with some disdain for labor and virtue."

\*\*\*

"The theatre served to set forth subversive theories on marriage and the family. Art inspired to a facile ideal of voluptuous levity. French thought was lulled to sleep as in a vague reverie produced by opium. A curious fact! The terrible year brought neither remedy nor change. The war was ended, the same taste, the same sort of reading, the same amusements reappeared. Only the press, now become free, furnished one outlet the more for that unhealthy prose, which abroad was currently denominated 'French prose,' and the influence of democracy was exercised in a stronger and more direct manner."

\*\*\*

David Nutt, London, has in press a reprint of the *editio princeps* of "El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha," edited with an introduction and notes by J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly and J. Ormsby. The edition will be limited to 500, perhaps to 300 copies. Macmillan & Co. receive subscriptions for the work in this country.

#### NOTES AND QUERIES FOR THOSE WHO TRAVEL.

Special Tour to Japan, China, and the Hawaiian Islands, August and September, 1897.

For several years past our tours to the Orient have been distinguished for their comprehensiveness and general high character, and for a much longer period our Hawaiian trips have been most favorably known. In announcing a special tour to those fascinating countries for the autumn and early winter of 1897, therefore, we have little reason to do more than announce the trip in brief terms, inasmuch as it is to be carried out upon the same liberal lines as in the past. Tourists generally have devoted too little time to Japan, a country that presents in its picturesque scenery, its arts and its quaint native life no end of interesting features. In no part of the world is traveling more delightful than in the "Land of the Rising Sun," and in no country does the stranger encounter more novel experiences. Enough of China may be seen within a comfortable day's journey of the great English treaty ports, and few foreigners penetrate far into the interior of the country.

Our tour for 1897 is so arranged that by an earlier departure from the eastern cities of this country, or from San Francisco, a comprehensive round of travel may be had through the Hawaiian Islands—the "Paradise of the Pacific"—this including a visit to the great living volcano of Kilauea. If Hawaii is to be included, the departure from Boston, New York and Philadelphia will be on Tuesday, August 24, and from Cleveland and Chicago a day later. The journey across the Continent in the latter case will be broken by a sojourn over Sunday at Salt Lake City.



## Wanamaker's.

**BUSINESS ENVELOPES.** LIBERALLY made, high-cut, well-gummed. No. 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ —size full six inches—

65c a thousand.  
35c for five hundred.

No less quantity sold.  
Printed, if you wish it—first thousand for 50c, additional thousand at 25c.  
Samples sent with pleasure.

### PAPER AND ENVELOPES—

A good correspondence paper—ladies' note—that often sells at 10c a quire—is here at 8c a pound—and that is four quires.

2 pounds for 15c.  
Hundred envelopes to match, 12c.  
Juniper street side.

**DIXIE CANOPIES.** THE completest, cutest, coolest canopy you ever saw is ready. It skips the failings of all the other sorts, and being attached to the bedstead, there is no defacement of ceiling with hook or ring. And it can be attached to any wood or metal bedstead without scar or scratch. That is a good deal to claim for a canopy, and that at \$2.75. Covered with mosquito net. Finer, covered with bobinet, \$5.

Loosen the string and it flies out of the way of its own accord. Think of the comfortable morning naps when flies can't get at you; think of the mosquito-rid nights!

Second floor, Thirteenth street.

## JOHN WANAMAKER.

### Why You Should Have It.

#### Bimetallism or

The Evils of Gold Monometallism and the Benefits of Bimetallism, \* \* \*

By WHARTON BARKER.

It discusses in every phase the most vital question of the day.

It is an exhaustive and conclusive work.

It is the clearest, fairest, most logical book ever written on bimetallism.

It presents facts and gives arguments based on proven facts to demonstrate why gold monometallism drives all producers to ruin and despair.

It shows why and how bimetallism will bring back general and lasting prosperity.

It is a book which will always have a distinct value of its own.

By all those best fitted to judge, it is admitted to be without an equal.

Only when you have read it can you appreciate why all this and much more is true. And you will find it to your advantage to do this at once, therefore send for a copy now.

Sent postpaid to any address on receipt of price.

Paper bound edition, - - \$ .50  
Library Edition, Cloth, - - 1.00

A limited number of slightly shop-worn copies—paper edition—are being sold at half price, 25 cents a copy. For all purposes as good as though fresh from the press.

**BARKER PUBLISHING CO.,**

119 South Fourth St.,

PHILADELPHIA.

Please mention The American.

Sailing from San Francisco September 2, this party will reach Honolulu September 9, and twenty days will be occupied in the trip to Hilo and the volcano and in a restful sojourn at Honolulu. In connection with this tour there will be an opportunity for persons who do not desire to visit Japan and China to return direct to San Francisco and the eastern cities, or to spend the winter on the Pacific Coast.

The main party, or the one which proposes to omit the Hawaiian tour, will leave Boston, New York and Philadelphia Monday, September 13th, and Cleveland and Chicago a day later. Crossing the Continent without delay, it will sail from San Francisco September 21st, and at Honolulu (where a stop of from twelve to twenty hours will be made) the Hawaiian party will join. Reaching Yokohama about the 10th of October, the party will have upwards of a month in which to travel through Japan, visiting Kamakura, Enoshima, Nikko, Lake Chuzenji, Tokyo, Miyashita, Hakone, Atami, Nagoya, Kyoto, Lake Biwa, Nara, Osaka, Kobe, the beautiful Inland Sea and Nagasaki. This period will embrace the Maple festivals, the Chrysanthemum season, the festivities surrounding the birthday of the Mikado, and other important events. Sailing from Nagasaki across the China Sea, visits will follow to Shanghai, Hong Kong, Canton and Macao, so that a good insight may be had of the "heart of China." Starting homeward from Hong Kong November 27th, there will be second visits, briefer than before, to Nagasaki, Kobe and Yokohama, with a second trip through the picturesque Inland Sea of Japan. Finally leaving Yokohama, December 9th, the party will sail for San Francisco via Honolulu, thus taking the pleasant and genial southern route at a season when it is far more inviting than the northern course. San Francisco will be reached December 26th, and the eastern cities by January 1st.

Messrs. Raymond & Whitcomb, 1005 Chestnut street, Philadelphia, will issue a special circular descriptive of the tour and profusely illustrated, and this will be forwarded by them to all persons interested in the trip.—*Adv.*

#### Deer Park on the Crest of the Alleghenies.

To those contemplating a trip to the mountains in search of health or pleasure, Deer Park, on the crest of the Alleghany Mountains, 3,000 feet above sea level, offers such varied attractions as a delightful atmosphere during both day and night, pure water, smooth, winding roads through the mountains and valleys, Cricket grounds, Ball grounds, Golf links, Tennis courts, and the most picturesque scenery in the Alleghany range. The hotel is equipped with all adjuncts conducive to the entertainment, pleasure and comfort of guests.

There are also a number of furnished cottages with facilities for housekeeping.

The houses and grounds are supplied with absolutely pure water, piped from the celebrated "Boiling Spring," and are lighted with electricity. Deer Park is on the main line of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, and has the advantage of its splendid Vestibule Limited Express trains between the East and West. Season excursion tickets, good for return passage until October 31st, will be placed on sale at greatly reduced rates at all principal ticket offices throughout the country.

The season at Deer Park commences June 21, 1897.

For full information as to rates, rooms, etc., address D. C. Jones, Manager, Camden Station, Baltimore, Md.—*Adv.*

#### NUGGETS AND NUBBINS.

THE great phrenologist was dazed  
And lost his usual suavity;  
He'd found a man who couldn't be praised,  
Because of his depravity.  
"You are a thief," said he; "I fear  
You steal when not prevented."  
"But William Shakespeare, he stole deer"—  
Said he: "I'm complimented."

"Your temper's bad, you're full of bile,  
You rave and fume intensely."  
"Oh, yes," said he; "so did Carlyle;  
You honor me immensely."  
"But you, sir, you are very vain  
And weakly egotistic."  
"Oh, yes," said he; "just like Montaigne;  
You're very eulogistic."

"You are a cynic." "So was Swift."  
"A scoffer." "So was Shelley."  
"For lying you've a mighty gift."  
"Well, so had Machiavelli."

## Wherever You are

on the dining car,  
in the cafe, touring  
awheel, avoid the danger  
of changing water,  
drink

## HIRES ROOTBEER

Carbonated.

Drives away thirst, dispels languor, increases your health, adds materially to the enjoyments of life. It's always ready for drinking and those who know its benefits are always ready to drink it.

Sold by all dealers by the bottle and in cases of two dozen pints. See that HIRE'S and the signature, Charles E. Hires Co., are on each bottle.

A Package of HIRE'S Root-beer extract makes 5 gallons. Sold as formerly, by all dealers.

The Charles E. Hires Co.  
PHILADELPHIA.

Join the  
**GAZE'S**  
**TOUR'S**  
Grand American Tour  
OF THE  
Manufacturers' Club  
TO  
Colorado, California, the Yosemite,  
and the Yellowstone National Park,  
Visiting 24 States and Territories.  
Escorted by Charles H. Adams.  
Number Limited. Leaving July 7 for 60 days.  
For itineraries for this and other American and  
European tours, apply to  
**ADAMS & HOWLAND, Agents,**  
14 S. Broad St., Phila.



## DEER + PARK

On the Crest of the Alleghenies.

(Main Line B. & O. R. R.)

Season Opens June 21st, 1897.

Superb Hotel and Cottages.

For rates, rooms and other information apply to D. C. JONES, Manager, B. & O. Central Building, Baltimore, Md., up to June 10th; after that date, Deer Park, Md.

A NEW WAY TO  
**FARMERS! SELL YOUR GRAIN.**  
HARVEY, author of Coin's Financial School. It is a monthly journal published at the storm center of political events: herads to its friends the movements of the enemy, and fearlessly defends the people against the encroachments of the money power. The price of subscription is only 25 cents a year. Address COIN PUBLISHING CO., 362 Washington Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

## If You Are Not

you should be a subscriber to The Patriots' Bulletin, edited by W. H. HARVEY, author of Coin's Financial School. It is a monthly journal published at the storm center of political events: herads to its friends the movements of the enemy, and fearlessly defends the people against the encroachments of the money power. The price of subscription is only 25 cents a year. Address COIN PUBLISHING CO., 362 Washington Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Please Mention The American.

"But you're conceited, proud and haut,  
A base of pride you're built on."  
"Well, so was Michael Angelo,  
And Dante and John Milton."

"Funds left with you would be misused,  
Or I am much mistaken;  
Men's trust in you would be abused"—  
"Why! How like Francis Bacon!  
Well, here's your fee; you've done me proud,  
You've ransacked history's pages  
To rank me with th' illustrious crowd  
Of great men of all ages."

—Sam Walter Foss.

Teacher—"Children, how is the earth divided?"  
Johnny Uptodate—"Between the sugar trust, the coffee  
trust, the beef trust and the Standard Oil Company."

It was at a police court. A witness for the defense had just  
been examined, when the prosecuting police sergeant stood up  
to crush him.

Sergeant—"Why did you hide Sullivan in your house on  
that Sunday night?"

Witness—"I did not see Sullivan at all on that night."

Sergeant (knowingly)—"Will you swear your wife did not  
hide Sullivan on that night?"

Witness (hesitatingly)—"Ye-es."

Sergeant (more knowingly)—"Will your wife swear that  
she did not hide Sullivan in your house on that night?"

Witness (more hesitatingly)—"Well—I—don't—think—  
so."

Sergeant (most knowingly)—"Ah! And perhaps you can  
tell the Court how it is you can swear your wife did not hide  
him, while she cannot swear the same thing. Speak up now,  
and tell the truth."

Witness (unhesitatingly)—"Well, you see, I'm not a mar-  
ried man."

A GOOD story is told of a Scotchman residing in San Fran-  
cisco, who had all his wits about him. He was the most argu-  
mentative and the calmest of men. They use firearms rather  
inopportunely at times out there, and early one morning, when  
the Scotchman (whom we will call Mr. M'Gregor) was returning  
home, he was thus accosted by an American citizen, suddenly  
holding up a pistol:

"Throw up your hands!"

"Why?" asked Mr. M'Gregor, calmly.

"Throw them up!"

"But what for?"

"Put up your hands," insisted the footpad, shaking his  
pistol. "Will you do what I tell you?"

"That depends," said Mr. M'Gregor. "If ye can show me  
any reason why I should put up ma hands, I'll no say but what  
I wull; but yer mere requaist wad be no justification for me to  
do so absurd a thing. Noo, why should you, a complete  
stranger, ask me at this 'oor o' the mornin' on public street  
ta pit up ma hands?"

"Dash you," cried the robber, "if you don't quit gassin'  
and obey orders, I'll blow the top of your head off!"

"What! Faith, man, ye must be oot o' yer heed. Come,  
noo, poor buddy," said M'Gregor, soothingly, coolly catching  
the pistol and wresting it with a quick twist out of the man's  
hand. "Come, now, an' I'll show ye where they'll take care o'  
ye. Hech! Dinna ye try to fecht, or, ecod, I'll shoot ye. By  
the way, ye might as weel put up yer ain hands, an' just walk  
ahead o' me. That's it. Trudge awa', noo."

And so Mr. M'Gregor marched his man to the city prison  
and handed him over to Captain Douglass.

"It wudna be a bad idea to put him in a straight-jacket,"  
he said, serenely, to the officer. "There's little doot but the  
buddy's daft."

And he resumed his uninterrupted homeward walk.

A few years ago two Japanese gentlemen of high standing  
were travelling in the United States, and, among other places,  
visited a large and widely-known manufactory. They were  
afterward invited by the senior member of the firm to lunch with  
him. Colonel M. was also of the party. It happened that the  
first food placed on the table was a dish of fried potatoes, and as  
the manufacturer enthusiastically explained his business to his  
guests, he unthinkingly took a piece of potato from the dish with  
his fingers and ate it. A second and third piece followed. The  
Japanese listened politely, but Colonel M. observed that they

were closely watching their host's method of eating. The colonel  
has a keen sense of humor, and he at once decided that he would  
follow his friend's example and see what the others would do.  
He did so and instantly both Japanese made a dive for the dish,  
and thus they sat eating potatoes with their fingers, presenting,  
it is to be feared, the appearance of four men who had had  
nothing to eat for a long while, and expected never to get any-  
thing again.

Will it be surprising if in a future Japanese book on America  
this breach of good manners shall find a place as an American  
custom?

## 1849 - VICK'S FLORAL GUIDE - 1897

Standard Seed and Plant Catalogue. Contains all that's New and Good. Always Reliable.

**THE GUIDE and your Choice** } One packet either Wonderful Branching Aster, New  
Japan Morning Glory, or Pansy Choice mixed, for **15 CTS.**  
Two packets 25c., three packets 30c. Full retail price 45 cts.

Vick's Illustrated Monthly Magazine which tells how to grow Plants, Flowers  
and Vegetables, and is up to date on these subjects, for 3 months, the Guide and One  
packet of Seeds (named above) for 25 cents.

Every tenth person sending an Order as above will receive a coupon good for 50 cents' worth of Seed free

When ordering state where you  
saw this adv. and we will send a  
packet of Flower Seeds free

**JAMES VICK'S SONS, ROCHESTER, N. Y.**

## VICK'S ILLUSTRATED MONTHLY MAGAZINE

"The BEST That Ever Came Down The Pike."



country lane or boulevard  
**THE MIRIAM  
BUGGY**

Strong, light, stylish  
Big inducements to first  
buyer in unoccupied  
territory. Write  
**THE BALDWIN CO.,**  
Blanchester, O.

**KING OF  
FLASH LIGHT POWDERS.**  
**LUXO**  
PATENTED.  
FOR SALE BY ALL DEALERS  
W. P. BUCHANAN PHILADELPHIA

NO-TO  
BAC

**DON'T** Tobacco Spit and Smoke Your Life Away.



**YOU** poison the air your loved ones  
breathe, and let nicotine rob you  
of your manhood. No wonder she  
is unhappy. Why don't you use  
your life force to bring the love-light to  
her eyes instead of spitting and smoking  
it away? Take **NO-TO-BAC** and be a  
man again, strong in the consciousness  
of your manliness and your power to  
make her happy. There's absolutely no  
excuse for you not being cured of the tobacco  
habit if you want to be, for **NO-TO-BAC** is sold  
by all druggists under an absolute guarantee to  
cure or money refunded. If you want to try  
**NO-TO-BAC** before you buy, write us, and we'll  
gladly send you our booklet and free sample.

Address: STERLING REMEDY CO., Chicago; Montreal, Can.; New York. 230

**We Have Told You**  
of the merits of

**BROWN'S SKIRT FASTENERS**

Our "T" does it.



WITHOUT

As evidence of their  
usefulness our mail orders  
of hundreds of letters  
daily are indisputable. If  
your merchant doesn't  
carry them in stock, send  
us 25c. for a sample  
post-paid.



WITH

**BROWN'S SKIRT FASTENER CO.**

S. E. Cor., Second and Spruce Streets,

Philadelphia, Pa.